

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 6, 2007 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 14-18, and 22-25 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added. Claims 26-33 have been cancelled. Claims 1-25 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-16 are objected to because of informalities; in particular, because of a typographical error in claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 1 to correct the error. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-7, 15-16, and 23-24 are objected to for reciting the phrase "configured to." Applicants have amended claims 6-7, 15-16, and 23-24 to clarify the structural limitation referred to therein. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7, 10-19 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chatel (U.S. Patent 5,506,751). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but have amended independent claims 1 and 17 to advance this application to allowance. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original subject matter via a continuing application.

Chatel discloses a card cage 10 having support rails 20, 21 and 22, 23 that carry grille elements 26 and 27. The rails, such as rail 20 in FIG. 5, have arms 41, 42 that define a slot 43. The grille element 26 is received within the slot 43 of the arms 20, 21. The rails further define an aperture 50 sized for receiving screws 24 (FIG. 1) which pass through side panels 12, 13 of the card cage 10.

A. Claims 1-7 and 10-16

Claim 1 recites a chassis having four elongated members, including two frontward members and two rearward members. A first cover is inserted within first retaining structure of each of one frontward and one rearward member. A second cover is inserted within the first retaining structure of each of the other frontward and rearward members. A back plane is inserted with the second retaining structure of the rearward members.

In the Office Action, the slot 43 defined by the rail (e.g., 20) of Chatel is characterized as a first retaining structure. The aperture 50 formed in the rail 20 is characterized as a second retaining structure.

Claim 1 now clarifies that the chassis has first and second covers inserted within the first retaining structure of certain members, and a back plane inserted within the second retaining structure of rearward members. While Chatel does disclose a connector panel 15 that defines a back plane; the connector panel 15 is not inserted within the second retaining structure, i.e., the rail apertures 50, as required by claim 1. The apertures 50 of Chatel are used instead to secure the side panels 12, 13 of the Chatel chassis, not the back plane. In the alternative, it is also respectfully noted that the connector panel 15 is not inserted within the second slot that opposes slot 43 of the rails. Chatel further does not teach or suggest that the rails 20, 21, 22, 23 can or could be modified to accommodate the insertion of the connector panel 15.

At least for this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-7 and 10-16 are patentable over Chatel.

B. Claims 17-19 and 21-25

Claim 17 recites a chassis having first and second pairs of elongated members. A top plate is captured by the first pair, and a bottom plate is captured by the second pair. A back plane is captured by one member of the first pair and another member of the second pair.

Claim 17 now clarifies that the chassis has top and bottom plates captured between pairs of elongated members, and a back plane captured between one member of each of those pairs. While Chatel does disclose a connector panel 15 that defines a back plane; the connector panel 15 is not captured by rails (e.g., 21, 23), as is required by claim 17. Chatel

further does not teach or suggest that the rails 20, 21, 22, 23 can or could be used to capture the connector panel 15 of the card cage 10.

Also, claim 24, which is dependent upon claims 22 and 17, recites that the top and bottom plates are captured within first slots of the members, and that modules received within the front opening of the chassis are retained by a second slot of one of the members. The Examiner asserts that the back plane (i.e., 15) of Chatel retains modules, however, claim 24 requires that the slot in a rail (not the back plane) retain each of the modules. Nowhere does Chatel teach or suggest that the slot 43, or the opposite slot shown, retains a module.

Further, claim 25, which is dependent upon claims 22 and 17, recites that the top and bottom plates are captured within first slots of the members and that the back plane is capture within second slots of the members. Chatel does not disclose rails having slots wherein the grille elements 26, 27 are capture with first slots of the rails and the connector panel 15 is captured with second slots of the rails.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 17, and dependent claims 18-19 and 21-25 are patentable over Chatel.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatel (U.S. Patent 5,506,751) in view of Hill et al. (U.S. Patent 5,546,282). Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatel (U. S. Patent 5,506,751) in view of Rebaudo et al. (U.S. Patent 4,470,100). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 8 and 9 depend upon claim 1. Claim 20 depends upon claim 17. In view of the above remarks regarding independent claims 1 and 17, further discussion regarding the independent patentability of dependent claims 8, 9, and 20 is believed to be unnecessary. Applicants submit that dependent claims 8, 9, and 20 are in condition for allowance.

SUMMARY

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (claims 1-25) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.

Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct.

Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.



Date: November 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Karen A. Fitzsimmons". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Karen A. Fitzsimmons
Reg. No. 50,470
KAF:cjc